

20th August 1925]

APPENDIX VIII.

[Vide answer to question No. 224 asked by Mr. R. Veerian at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 20th August 1925, page 339 supra.]

Letter from the President, District Board, North Arcot, D. Dis.  
No. 691/D.B., dated 11th July 1925.

I visited Solur village near Ambur on the 10th instant, and made personal enquiries in the village. I found that the vaccinator visited the village on three successive days, 29th January 1925, 30th January 1925 and 31st January 1925, and vaccinated people on all these three days. This was done in the open street in front of the late monigar's house. On all these three days, most of the villagers were present and witnessed the operations. On the first day, he vaccinated some Hindu children and on the second day the Adi-Dravida women and children were vaccinated; and I am satisfied from the statements of the village munsif and all the villagers that the Adi-Dravida women allowed themselves to be revaccinated yielding to the preachings of the vaccinator and the advice of the village munsif. The vaccinator had absolutely no motive to forcibly vaccinate the women or to threaten them to submit themselves to the operation. The villagers say that none of the women were laid up with fever nor disabled from doing any work and that they were found going about the village on their usual avocations even from the day of their being vaccinated. I do not believe that the women were actually suffering from fever nor were the vaccination wounds bleeding at the time of Mr. Veerian's visit. I believe that the women were taken before Mr. Veerian in a group and made to complain collectively that they were all suffering from fever and pain. The marks were then healing. Seeing that the vaccinator visited the village the next day also (31st January 1925) and again performed some more operations without being molested either by the villagers or the men of the cheri, it seems to me that there is no foundation for the charge that he threatened the women with corporal punishment and forcibly revaccinated them. I saw all the women and found them quite hale and hearty and they all say that they were unwilling to undergo the operation but were subsequently prevailed upon by the vaccinator's and village munsif's importunities and that they suffered from pain and fever for a few days.

APPENDIX IX.

[Vide answer to question No. 250 asked by Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 20th August 1925, page 350 supra.]

*Copy of application from the Rajah of Bobbili, dated the 16th April 1924,  
to the Collector of Ganjam, Chatrapur.*

I have the honour to request that you will be good enough to have sections 26, 32 and 58 of the Forest Act V of 1882 extended to my forests in the Biridi estate to ensure better management of the same.

2. The sub-clause of section 32 under which I prefer to have the forests managed is 32 (c).